

REMARKS

Claims 5 and 8 have been converted from dependent form into independent form. This change in form does not narrow or limit the scope of the claims. Claim 8 has been amended to be slightly broader than claim 8 as originally filed. The independent claim which claims 5 and 8 were formerly dependent upon has not been cancelled. Therefore, the full scope of the doctrine of equivalents should apply to claims 5 and 8 as if they were originally presented in independent form when the application was filed. In view of paragraph 5 of the office action, claims 5-8 should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hotea (US 5,645,458). Claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotea (US 5,645,458) in view of Koide (US 6,468,116). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claim 2 has been canceled above and its features have been added to claim 1. Claim 1 now claims that the contact blade comprises at least one formed part created in a folding zone of the contact blade. Koide discloses groove 15A. However, groove 15A is located on a fastening piece 12 for crimping onto a wire W. Thus, Koide merely discloses providing groove 15A on the wire fastening piece (un-numbered) of Hotea; at rear part 5 in applicants' drawings. There is no disclosure or suggestion of providing the groove 15A of Koide at the front bends of the contact arms 8, 10 of Hotea. This suggestion only comes after reading applicants' patent application.

The "groove" 15A in Koide is quite different from the formed part 12, 12' in applicants' invention. The groove 15A is made at the rear part of the terminal for crimping of the wire; the technical problems (permanent deformation) to be solved being quite different of those incurred by the elastic contact blades as in applicants' invention. The purpose of groove 15A is to prevent the 180° folding (reverse fold) of the crimping piece (see column 1, lines 41-51 and column 2, lines 5-11 and Figs. 12 and 13). In applicants' invention the blades 11 are always intentionally folded about 180° during manufacturing of the terminal. The purpose of formed parts 12, 12' is to lower the stress in such a way that, although there is folding, breaking is prevented and the blades 11 can resiliently deflect when a male terminal is inserted between the blades 11. There is no disclosure or suggestion in the cited art of combining the art to produce applicants' claimed invention of a contact blade comprising at least one formed part created in a folding zone of the contact blade. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 3-4 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. For example, claim 4 claims that the formed parts are made in the folded zone of the contact blade towards the inside of the cage. This is not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are

clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington

Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686)

9/6/06

Date

**Customer No.: 29683**  
Harrington & Smith, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

9/6/2006  
Date

Clair F. Mire  
Name of Person Making Deposit